Sound waves and vortices in a polarized relativistic fluid

David Montenegro[1], Leonardo Tinti[2], Giorgio Torrieri[1]
[1] *IFGW,Unicamp, Campinas, Brasil and*
[2] *The Ohio State University*
(Dated: December 8,2007)

We extend the effective theory approach to the ideal fluid limit where the polarization of the fluid is non-zero. After describing and motivating the equations of motion [1], we expand them around the hydrostatic limit, obtaining the sound wave and vortex degrees of freedom. We discuss how the presence of polarization affects the stability and causality of the ideal fluid limit.

arXiv:1703.03079v1 [hep-th] 9 Mar 2017

Relativistic hydrodynamics is an area which currently enjoys a high level of both theoretical and phenomenological activity [2]. Heavy ion collision experiments have been shown to be well described by hydrodynamic simulations. The connection of hydrodynamics to microscopic theory, and the development of hydrodynamics as an effective field theory, are however still not well understood.

The direct observation of polarization of Λ particles in heavy ion collisions [3] and microscopic strongly coupled systems [4], as well as phenomena such as chiral transport and anomalies [5–9] has motivated the phenomenological study of vorticiity in relativistic fluids [10–12] and its relationship to microscopic spin polarization.

A "realistic" effective theory for describing the relationship between vorticity and polarization in the ideal fluid limit is however still in development. Vorticity does not emerge in the transport limit, but rather close to the thermodynamic/hydrodynamic regime. The former was studied within the usual thermodynamic techniques, updated with the inclusion of angular momentum [13–15], but this is not a realistic setup for a strongly coupled dynamical system, where equilibrium is to a good approximation local rather than global.

The authors in [12] used a Cooper-Frye formula extended to spinor observables, assuming polarization is zero before freezeout. This assumption however violates detailed balance across the freezeout hypersurface [16]. If hadrons after freeze-out carry both vorticity and spin polarization, then so must the microscopic constituents during the evolution of the fluid [1] and the backreaction needs to be taken into account.

The problem here is a conceptual one: if one defines the ideal fluid limit in terms of isotropy of the comoving frame [17], the transfer of angular momentum to spin is forbidden, or at least dictated by the coarse-graining scale [10]. However, the local hydrostatic limit in the presence of angular momentum and spin explicitly necessitates of such an anisotropy [13], for the maximum entropy state for a medium where microscopic degres of freedom have spin generally has polarization [18]. And, of course, vorticity, the conserved current of the diffeomorphism invariance within perfect fluid dynamics [19, 20], is be broken [1] if angular momentum can be transferred to local polarization.

Usual insights from transport theory can be misleading since polarization is a breakdown of molecular chaos, since it is a two-particle microscopic phase space correlation [1]. To overcome this, one needs the effective field theory approach, succesfully used to both define ideal [22–26] and dissipative [27] hydrodynamics: One writes down hydrodynamics in lagrangian form, and treats the microscopic scale as an effective Planck constant and develops fluctuation-driven terms within the effective field theory. In addition, however, polarization requires the introduction of additional degrees of freedom, which explicitly break isotropy. In [1] we constructed such a theory. We shall briefly introduce it and examine its behavior close to hydrostatic equilibrium.

In this approach perfect fluid without polarization can be described by three fields, representing the comoving ("Lagrangian") coordinate systems ϕ^I. Fluidity can be defined via symmetries, namely the invariance of the lagrangian under a volume-preserving diffeomorphism invariance [19, 26, 28]. In general

$$L(\phi_I \to \xi_I(\phi_J)) \to L \quad , \quad \det\left[\frac{\partial \xi_I}{\partial \phi_J}\right] = 1 \tag{1}$$

It directly follows [19, 28] that the lagrangian is of the form, at the lowest order in gradients

$$L = F(b) \quad , \quad b = \sqrt{\det_{IJ}\left[B_{IJ}\right]} \quad , \quad B_{IJ} = \partial_\mu \phi_I \partial^\mu \phi_J \tag{2}$$

The Lagrangian above straight-forwardly yields the general energy momentum tensor whose conservation yields Euler's equations [19, 26, 28],

$$\partial_\mu T^{\mu\nu} = 0 \quad , \quad T^{\mu\nu} = (p+e)u^\mu u^\nu - p g^{\mu\nu} \tag{3}$$

if one substitutes, for energy density e, pressure p and chemical potential μ

$$e = \frac{dF(b,\mu)}{d\mu} - F(b,\mu) \quad , \quad p = F(b,\mu) - \frac{dF(b,\mu)}{db} b \tag{4}$$

the latter, defined in terms of an internal $U(1)$ conserved current J^μ and the chemical shift symmetry [28]

$$L(\phi_I, e^{i\alpha}) \to L(\phi_I, e^{i\alpha + \psi(\phi_I)})$$

to be

$$\mu = b^{-1} J^\mu \partial_\mu \psi$$

The lagrangian in general is related to the free energy by a legendre transformation w.r.t. the chemical potential.

The diffeomorphism symmetries and the chemical shift allow for a uniquely defined flow velocity

$$u_\mu = \frac{1}{6b}\epsilon_{IJK}\epsilon_{\mu\alpha\beta\gamma}\partial^\alpha\phi^I\partial^\beta\phi^J\partial^\gamma\phi^K = \frac{J^\mu}{\sqrt{-J^\nu J_\nu}} \quad (5)$$

with the comoving projector being

$$\Delta^{\mu\nu} = B_{IJ}^{-1}\partial^\mu\phi^I\partial^\nu\phi^J \quad (6)$$

If the system has intrinsic polarization,the coordinates $\phi^I(x)$ are not enough because they do not contain information about polarization. Moreover, because of the conceptual difficulties described earlier, we need to define precisely what we mean by the ideal hydrodynamic limit, especially because of the polarizations breaking of local isotropy and vorticity conservation. We take the ideal hydrodynamic limit to mean that dynamics is dependent only on the flow u^μ and comoving variables, the comoving variables are defined entirely by local entropy maximization, and that only sound waves and vortices arise as local excitations[1].

Regarding the polarization effective degrees of freedom $y^{\mu\nu}$, they have been defined in Ref [1] as the (infinitesimal) volume integral of the total angular momentum of a fluid cell in the local comoving frame, normalized using the volum of the cell itself. This can be interpreted as a way to keep track of the angular momentum structure of the fluid during a coarse graining procedure. Angular momentum conservation has always been considered in relativistic hydrodynamics, therefore no new symmetry has to be added, only the new polarization degrees of freedom: the lack of a spin tensor and the symmetry of the stress-energy tensor imply local angular momentum conservation both for ideal and viscous hydrodynamics.

If the polarization were "passively transported along the fluid", in other worlds, if polarization were conserved, then one wold need an additional symmetry on the effective Lagrangian. This situation is similar to the *actual* $U(1)$ symmetry considered in Ref [28], where the phase invariance, represented by an explicit dependence of the Lagrangian on the gradient of the local phase, was not enough to recover ideal (non-polarized) hydrodynamics, because the electric current is not guaranteed to be proportional to the energy flux. To enforce this requirement one can introduce the concept of shift symmetry, which can be interpreted as an invariance of physics under local rescaling of the electric charge units. If one uses the same formalism to describe the flow of the spin current ($y^{\mu\nu}$ in the comoving frame), one would have

$$L\left(y^{\mu\nu}(x)\right) = L\left(y^{\mu\nu}(x) + f^{\mu\nu}(\phi^I(x))\right), \quad (7)$$

which would represent, not only the invariance of physics under rescaling of the polarization units, but also invariance under an arbitrary addition of an extra polarization which is constant along the flux lines. Following [28] , the invariant that should enter the effective Lagrangian is

$$\dot{y}^{\mu\nu} = u\cdot\partial\, y^{\mu\nu}.$$

If we apply the "revised" chemical shift (7), $\dot{y}^{\mu\nu}$ is invariant since $\partial_\mu\phi_I$ will enter in the derivative and annihillate with $u^\mu\partial_\mu\phi_I$ is vanishing by construction.

Conservation of angular momentum, even in the ideal limit, does not imply that polarization should correspond to an even approximatel conserved current. We therefore treat $y^{\mu\nu}$ as an auxiliary field distinct from ϕ_I, and impose the interaction between orbital and spin angular momentum via the equation of state. In order for local equilibrium to be well-defined, we chose to write directly the polarization degrees as proportional to the local vorticity,

$$y_{\mu\nu} = \chi(b,\omega^2)\omega_{\mu\nu} \quad (8)$$

a violation of this condition will inevitably result in Goldstone modes and topological constraints which create long-term correlations which make a hydrodynamic limit impossible [1]. Note that in an external field such as (but not only) magnetohydrodynamics [33, 36], this symmetry would be broken and the Lagrangian would depend directly on polarization. In general one expects a Lagrangian which depends on $\dot{y}^{\mu\nu}$, $y^{\mu\nu}$ and mixed terms all together.

By counting gradients and enforcing symmetries, the lowest order term which respects the internal diffeomorphism symmetry is $y_{\mu\nu}y^{\mu\nu}$. For example $det[y]$ is a higher term in gradient (y being proportional to the vorticity, which is a gradient), $\epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma\rho}\partial^\mu J^\nu y^{\gamma\rho}$ would violate parity and $\partial_\mu J_\nu y^{\mu\nu}$ be higher order in gradient, again. Parity violating terms would of course be permitted in the context of anomalous hydrodynamics). Considering that polarization introduces a correlation between microstates, the presence of polarization at a given entropy b should change the free energy, to leading order in gradient, as $b \to b\left(1 - cy_{\mu\nu}y^{\mu\nu}\right)$ where c is a dimensionful constant representing polarizeability (it can be positive for a ferromagnetic material and negative for an antiferromagnetic one). For dimensional reasons, $c \sim T_0^2$ Given this, a physically reasonable way to introduce polarization that we adopted is

$$F(b,y) \to F\left(b \times f(y)\right) \quad , \quad f(y) = 1 - cy_{\mu\nu}y^{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{O}\left(y^4\right) \quad (9)$$

For instance, the ideal gas without polarization with density n of particles of which a fraction α are polarized, assuming nearest-neighbor interactions $b \sim n(1-\alpha^2)$ and $F(b) \sim b^{4/3}(1-\alpha^2)$, making $c \sim 3/4$.

We can now make the link between the lagrangian formulation and usual thermodynamics using the methods of [28] but with the angular momentum in lieu of chemical potential (note that the collinearity between angular momentum and polarization is what makes this analogy possible). While physically, because of lack of isotropy

it is non-trivial to relate the usual derivatives of the free energy to what we know as pressure and energy density, the existence of some free energy F to be minimized will lead to a constraint of the type

$$dF(b,y) = \partial_b F\, ds + \partial_{y_{\mu\nu}} F\, dy^{\mu\nu} = \\ = -(1-cy^2)F' ds - 2cbF' y^{\mu\nu} dy_{\mu\nu}. \tag{10}$$

which allows us to link the constant of proportionality in Eq. 8 to F via Legendre transfroms

$$-2cbF' y^{\mu\nu} = -2cb\chi F' \omega^{\mu\nu} \propto \frac{1}{T}$$

If we had F in terms of a partition function we could find χ given a local temperature and vorticity explicitly, via a derivation along the lines of [7]. Note that the QCD equation of state dependence on angular momentum, necessary to calculate χ, is as yet unknown, but it should be strictly related to the equation of state at finite magnetic field by the amount of angular momentum carried by that magnetic field.

The equation of motion, using the standard Euler-Lagrange equations, is

$$\partial_\mu J^\mu_I = 0, \tag{11}$$

where

$$J^\mu_I = 4\,c\,\partial_\nu \left\{ F' \left[\chi\left(\chi + 2\,\partial_{\Omega^2}\chi\right)\omega_{\alpha\beta}\, g^{\alpha\{\mu} P_I^{\nu\}\beta} \right] \right\} -$$

$$-F'\left[u_\rho P_I^{\rho\mu}\left(1-cy^2-2cb\chi\omega^2\,\partial_b\chi\right)\right] - 2c\left(\chi + 2\,\omega^2\,\partial_{\Omega^2}\chi\right)F' \times$$

$$\times \left\{ \left[\chi\,\omega^2 - \frac{1}{b} y_{\rho\sigma}\left(u_\alpha \partial^\alpha K^\rho - u_\alpha \nabla^\rho K^\alpha\right) \right] P_I^{\sigma\mu} - \right.$$

$$\left. - \frac{1}{6b} y_{\rho\sigma} \varepsilon^{\mu\rho\alpha\beta} \epsilon_{IJK} \nabla^\sigma \partial_\alpha \phi^J \partial_\beta \phi^K \right\}.$$

with $P^K_{\mu\nu} = \partial K_\mu / \partial^\mu \phi^K$, $\nabla^\alpha = \Delta^{\alpha\beta}\partial_\beta$ and $[...], ...$ corresponding to, respectively, antisymmetrization and symmetrization of the indices, as done in [32].

In addition to generally breaking homogeneity and vorticity conservation, unlike non-polarized hydrodynamics the higher gradient in velocity dependence these equations will be higher than 2nd order in gradient. To understand the consequences of this, we linearized the hydrostatic limit with "temperature" $T_0 \sim b_0^{1/3}$,

$$\phi_I = T_0\left(X_I + \pi_I\right), \tag{12}$$

Not that this is not the actual temperature of the background, it is proportional to that only in the conformal limit. Using the notation in [35], where $\partial\pi$ is shorthand for $\partial_i \pi_J$ and $[\partial\pi]$ for its trace and time derivatives are denoted by dots, the non-polarized hydrodynamics gives the usual wave equation for sound waves, the stationary vortex state polarization terms which will increase the gradients at each order by one unit. The free part of the equation will be

$$\mathcal{L} = A\left\{ [\partial\pi] - \frac{1}{2}[\partial\pi\cdot\partial\pi] - \frac{1}{2}\dot{\pi}^2 \right\} + \tag{13}$$

$$+B\left\{ (\partial_\rho \dot{\pi})\cdot(\partial^\rho\dot{\pi}) + [\partial\dot{\pi}\cdot\partial\dot{\pi}] \right\} + \left(\frac{1}{2}A + C\right)[\partial\pi]^2.$$

where the constants A, B, C are

$$A = T_0 F'(b_0), \qquad B = A\,c\,\chi^2(b_0,0), \qquad C = \frac{1}{2} b_0^2 F''(b_0), \tag{14}$$

giving an equation of motion

$$4B\left\{ \dddot{\pi}^I - \sum_j \partial_j^2 \ddot{\pi}^I + \partial_I \partial_J \ddot{\pi}^J \right\} + A\ddot{\pi}^I - 2C\partial_I\partial_J \pi^J \tag{15}$$

Note that this will *always* make these excitations susceptible to Ostrogradski's instabilities, from lowest order [31].

To go further, we decompose the perturbation into an irrotational and rotational parts

$$\vec{\pi} = \vec{\nabla}\varphi(x^\mu) + \vec{\nabla}\times\vec{\Omega}(x^\mu) \tag{16}$$

, which, in the linearized limit, have their own Fourier modes

$$\begin{pmatrix} \varphi \\ \vec{\Omega} \end{pmatrix} = \int dw d^3k \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_0 \\ \vec{\Omega}_0 \end{pmatrix} \exp\left[i\left(\vec{k_{L,T}}.\vec{x} - w_{L,T} t \right) \right] \tag{17}$$

For the Longitudinal ones we have

$$4B\,\omega_L^4 - A\omega_L^2 + 2Ck^2 = 0, \tag{18}$$

if this is well defined we recognize already that there is a hydrodynamic solution (that is, the frequency goes to zero when the momentum vanishes). In order to be well defined we need

$$A^2 - 32BC\,k^2 \geq 0. \tag{19}$$

It is alwways well defined for small frequencies, but, depending on the sign of BC.

The two solutions for ω_L^2 are

$$\omega_L^2 = \frac{A}{8B} \pm \sqrt{\left(\frac{A}{8B}\right)^2 - \frac{Ck^2}{2B}} \tag{20}$$

Note that, depending on the parameters and on the momentum scale, this can be complex. An imaginary part to the frequency corresponds to damped modes and instabilities.



FIG. 1. The maximum of the soundwave velocity w/k plotted against the parameters A/B and C/B. All axes are in logarithm base 10

Applying the machinery to the transverse modes we get

$$4B\,\omega_T^4 - 4B\,k^2\,\omega_T^2 - A\,\omega_T^2 = 0. \tag{21}$$

There is always a couple of non hydrodynamic modes associated withe the vorticous excitations. The solutions for ω_T^2 are

$$\omega_T = 0, \qquad \omega_T^2 = \frac{A}{4B} + k^2, \tag{22}$$

We have calculated the maximum possible wave velocity for w_L numerically, and it is shown as a function of the coefficients in Fig. 1 On the one hand, as one can see, polarization has important consequences on vortex non-propagation [26]. For a general equation of state, a change in temperature due to the propagation of a sound wave will also change the susceptibility. Because of conservation of angular momentum, this will also change the vorticity. This mixing between sound waves and vortices due to the sensitivity of the equation of state to polarization will allow vortices to propagate and create an effective hydrostatic limit even in the hydrodynamic limit in the presence of fluctuations, which could lead to stabilization [1] for small vorticities, the "fluctuation-driven turbulence" phase conjectured in [22, 23]. On the other hand, the ideal hydrodynamic limit also leads to a non-causal propagation for both sound and group velocity, as shown in Fig. 1 where A/B and C/B are systematically varied, and w/k is maximized. For all significant values ($\gg 10^{-2}$) of these parameters, w/k goes significantly above the causal limit. This is actually a reasonable result, as it is a direct consequence of the fact that the Free energy F, and hence the local dynamics, is sensitive to an accelleration (similar non-causal dissipative violations of propagation were found at higher gradient order in [32, 34]). Ostrogradski's theorem guarantees such Lagrangians are unstable (and one needs the Lagrangian picture to see this instability), and hence hydrodynamic systems including a response to angular momentum in the EoS will not have a stable ideal hydrodynamic limit. Additional terms in the Lagrangian depending on ϕ_I only generally do not change this conclusion. One would need then to take into account the polarization as a separate dynamical degree of freedom from the vorticity and include $\dot{y}^{\mu\nu}$ (and $y^{\mu\nu}$ since polarization is not a conserved quantity). Note that in this way it is possible to obtain an Israel-Stewart type equation

$$\tau_\Omega u_\alpha \partial^\alpha y_{\mu\nu} + y_{\mu\nu} = \chi\omega_{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{O}\left(\omega^2\right) \tag{23}$$

which could resolve this issue, with an appropriate relaxation time τ_Ω, like it did for first order viscous hydrodynamics. The procedure to use is similar to what has already been done in Ref [24] to insert a relaxation time equation for the pressure correction, however it is important to remind that the current formalism used is incompatible with dissipative processes (indeed any time irreversible process), and it must be extended as it was done in Ref [24] itself. It is mandatory to double the degrees of freedom (or double the time dimension, with the average of the two time coordinates as the physical time) in order to theoretically justify an effective Lagrangian as the leftover of the underlying (full) Lagrangian, after "integrating out" the microscopic degrees of freedom. In this extended formalism angular momentum (and in fact even four-momentum) conservation has to be enforced on the with additional conditions, fore more informations on the subject see, for instance Ref. [37, 38].

This is very different from ideal spinless hydrodynamics, where Navier-Stokes equations necessitate of relaxation dynamics but Euler equations are well-defined. In hydrodynamics with polarization, there seems to be a general conflict between causality and the non-dissipative regime, one which might lead to a quantitative lower limit for dissipation (the τ_Ω needed to restore causality) in systems whose fundamental constituents have spin. This will be quantitatively examined in a subsequent work.

In conclusion, we took the effective theory for ideal hydrodynamics in the presence of polarization, linearized it under hydrostatic equilibrium and examined the behavior of the lowest-lying modes, sound wave and vortical. Unlike in normal ideal hydrodynamics, the two mix. On the one hand, this is likely to stabilize the vortex mode by adding an effective soft energy gap to it. On the other, causality of sound propagation is no longer guaranteed even in the ideal limit unless polarization effects are soft enough. Fixing this most likely requires introducing relaxation (Israel-Stewart) type dynamics already from the ideal fluid limit, and this has implications for the minimum viscosity for fluids whose microscopic degrees of freedom have non-zero spin.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Acknowledgements GT acknowledges support from FAPESP proc. 2014/13120-7 and CNPQ bolsa de produtividade 301996/2014-8. LT was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Nuclear Physics under Award No. de-sc0004286 and Polish National Science Center Grant DEC-2012/06/A/ST2/00390. DM would like to acknowledge CNPQ graduate fellowship n. 147435/2014-5 Parts of this work were done when LT visited Campinas on FAEPEX fellowship number 2020/16, as well as when GT participated in the INT workshop "Exploring the QCD Phase Diagram through Energy Scans " We thank FAEPEX and the INT organizers for the support provided. We wish to thank Miklos Gyulassy for enlightening discussions which posed the conceptual challenges that eventually led to this work, and Mike Lisa for showing us experimental literature and useful discussions.

[1] D. Montenegro, L. Tinti and G. Torrieri, arXiv:1701.08263 [hep-th].

[2] R. D. de Souza, T. Koide and T. Kodama, arXiv:1506.03863 [nucl-th].

[3] I. Upsal [STAR Collaboration], J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **736**, no. 1, 012016 (2016). doi:10.1088/1742-6596/736/1/012016

[4] Igor Zutic, Alex Matos-Abiague, "Spin Hydrodynamics" Nature Physics **12** 24-25 (2016)

[5] M. A. Stephanov and Y. Yin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 162001 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.162001 [arXiv:1207.0747 [hep-th]].

[6] J. Y. Chen, D. T. Son and M. A. Stephanov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, no. 2, 021601 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.021601 [arXiv:1502.06966 [hep-th]].

[7] A. Aristova, D. Frenklakh, A. Gorsky and D. Kharzeev, JHEP **1610**, 029 (2016) doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2016)029 [arXiv:1606.05882 [hep-ph]].

[8] D. T. Son and P. Surowka, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 191601 (2009) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.103.191601 [arXiv:0906.5044 [hep-th]].

[9] E. V. Gorbar, D. O. Rybalka and I. A. Shovkovy, arXiv:1702.07791 [hep-th].

[10] B. Betz, M. Gyulassy and G. Torrieri, Phys. Rev. C **76**, 044901 (2007) doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.76.044901 [arXiv:0708.0035 [nucl-th]].

[11] Z. T. Liang and X. N. Wang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 102301 (2005) [arXiv:nucl-th/0410079].

[12] F. Becattini, L. Csernai and D. J. Wang, Phys. Rev. C **88**, no. 3, 034905 (2013) Erratum: [Phys. Rev. C **93**, no. 6, 069901 (2016)] doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.93.069901, 10.1103/PhysRevC.88.034905 [arXiv:1304.4427 [nucl-th]].

[13] F. Becattini, V. Chandra, L. Del Zanna and E. Grossi, Annals Phys. **338**, 32 (2013) doi:10.1016/j.aop.2013.07.004 [arXiv:1303.3431 [nucl-th]].

[14] F. Becattini and L. Tinti, Annals Phys. **325**, 1566 (2010) [arXiv:0911.0864 [gr-qc]].

[15] F. Becattini, F. Piccinini and J. Rizzo, Phys. Rev. C **77**, 024906 (2008) doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.77.024906 [arXiv:0711.1253 [nucl-th]].

[16] Y. Cheng, L. P. Csernai, V. K. Magas, B. R. Schlei and D. Strottman, Phys. Rev. C **81**, 064910 (2010) [arXiv:1006.5820 [nucl-th]].

[17] Lifshitz and Landau, Fluid Dynamics

[18] K. Huang, Statistical mechanics

[19] S. Dubovsky, T. Gregoire, A. Nicolis and R. Rattazzi, JHEP **0603**, 025 (2006) [hep-th/0512260].

[20] S.Endlich, PhD thesis, Columbia university, 2011

[21] B. Betz, D. Henkel and D. H. Rischke, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **62**, 556 (2009) doi:10.1016/j.ppnp.2008.12.018 [arXiv:0812.1440 [nucl-th]].

[22] G. Torrieri Phys. Rev. D **85**, 065006 (2012)

[23] T. Burch and G. Torrieri, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 1, 016009 (2015) [arXiv:1502.05421 [hep-lat]].

[24] D. Montenegro and G. Torrieri, arXiv:1604.05291 [hep-th].

[25] M. Crossley, P. Glorioso and H. Liu, arXiv:1511.03646 [hep-th].

[26] S. Endlich, A. Nicolis, R. Rattazzi and J. Wang, JHEP **1104**, 102 (2011) [arXiv:1011.6396 [hep-th]].

[27] S. Grozdanov and J. Polonyi, Phys. Rev. D **91**, no. 10, 105031 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.91.105031 [arXiv:1305.3670 [hep-th]].

[28] S. Dubovsky, L. Hui, A. Nicolis and D. T. Son, arXiv:1107.0731 [hep-th].

[29] quantum theory of fields I

[30] P. Kovtun, G. D. Moore and P. Romatschke, arXiv:1104.1586 [hep-ph].

[31] R. P. Woodard, Scholarpedia **10**, no. 8, 32243 (2015) doi:10.4249/scholarpedia.32243 [arXiv:1506.02210 [hep-th]].

[32] R. Baier, P. Romatschke, D. T. Son, A. O. Starinets and M. A. Stephanov, JHEP **0804**, 100 (2008) doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2008/04/100 [arXiv:0712.2451 [hep-th]].

[33] P. Kovtun, JHEP **1607**, 028 (2016) doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2016)028 [arXiv:1606.01226 [hep-th]].

[34] G. S. Denicol, H. Niemi, E. Molnar and D. H. Rischke, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 114047 (2012) Erratum: [Phys. Rev. D **91**, no. 3, 039902 (2015)] doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.85.114047, 10.1103/PhysRevD.91.039902 [arXiv:1202.4551 [nucl-th]].

[35] B. Gripaios and D. Sutherland, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, no. 7, 071601 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.114.071601 [arXiv:1406.4422 [hep-th]].

[36] S. Grozdanov, D. M. Hofman and N. Iqbal, arXiv:1610.07392 [hep-th].

[37] C. R. Galley, D. Tsang and L. C. Stein, arXiv:1412.3082 [math-ph].

[38] C. R. Galley, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, no. 17, 174301 (2013) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.110.174301 [arXiv:1210.2745 [gr-qc]].